



Minutes – City Planning Commission

1,892nd Meeting

6:00 P.M. August 4, 2005
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
3900 MAIN STREET

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Comer, Densmore, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary, Sebelia

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

STAFF PRESENT: Gutierrez, Planning Director
Aaron, Deputy Planning Director
Jenkins, Principal Planner
Milosevic, Associate Planner
Smith, Deputy City Attorney
Andrade, Stenographer

THE FOLLOWING BUSINESS WAS CONDUCTED:

Chair Leonard called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was given to the Flag.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

H. PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.....	3
14. PLANNING CASE P04-0178: Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.	3
Industrial Zones	3
Item 11 – Permitted Uses Table 19.150.020(A)	4
Article V.....	6
Article VI.....	6
Article VII.....	7
Article VIII – Items 20-25	8
Article IX – Items 33-37	8
Article X – Definitions (items 38-47).....	9
Items 49-50	9
Individual Site Requests	10
Site A – 3215, 3230 and 3245 Madison Street	10
Area B – 3772 Arlington Avenue/3762 Hardin Street.....	11
Area C – 3770 – 3780 Washington Street	11
Area D – Hunter Business Park Sites	11
Area E – 11503 Pierce St.	12
Area H – 4151 and 4221 Buchanan Street.....	12
Area I – Sycamore Canyon Business Park	13
Area L – 1145 Everton Pl.	13
Area M – Rohr Property (BF Goodrich).....	14
Item 5 – Zoning Map	14
B. ADJOURNMENT.....	16
2. Adjournment to the August 18, 2005 meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the Art Pick Council Chambers.....	16

H. PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.

- 14. PLANNING CASE P04-0178:** Planning Commission review of the General Plan 2025 Program and related Final Program Environmental Impact Report (SCH NO. 2004021108). The General Plan 2025 Program consists of the following components: 1) the City of Riverside General Plan 2025; 2) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and the rezoning of properties to reflect new zone names; 3) the comprehensive revision of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (Title 18 of the Municipal Code); 4) the Citywide Design Guidelines; and 5) the Implementation Plan.

Chair Leonard announced that the Commission was still in a closed hearing regarding the Zoning Code. He stated that there would be an opportunity for public comment at the end of this session. As a public comment session, the Commission will be unable to engage in dialogue and take any action but it would be the citizen's opportunity to convey any information.

Industrial Zones

Commissioner Densmore summarized the actions of the Commission at the previous meeting.

Chair Leonard added that at the last meeting the Commission requested a table comparing the existing and proposed zones. Staff pointed out that this table was included in the staff report, volume 1.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendations for the area along Jurupa and Van Buren, including the businesses on the south side of Van Buren (the same area specifically granted the I-Industrial General Plan designation). The motion will designate the I-Industrial Zone with the provision that if a business is currently legal, they will continue to be legal under the Industrial Zone.

Craig Aaron, Deputy Planning Director, asked for clarification on the motion with regard to "legal". He asked if "legal" would be nonconforming or legal similar to the motion for the duplexes.

Commissioner Densmore replied that his intent was legal conforming uses.

Chair Leonard asked if the motion was accepting staff's recommendation specifically for the areas on Jurupa Avenue only?

Commissioner Densmore replied affirmatively.

Commissioner Comer stated that his concern with changing the existing M-1 and M-2 Zoned properties to the I-Industrial Zone was the loss of legal rights when the property is sold and that the future property owner could no longer continue the use in that building.

Commissioner Densmore explained that this was somewhat of a compromise in that the legal businesses would retain their rights as if nothing changed.

Commissioner Comer noted there are several other industrial areas in the community, yet because the group in Jurupa has been the most vocal, they will retain their legal status. He asked staff how they felt about giving these businesses legal status as opposed to the nonconforming rights. He further added that

in the Zoning Code nonconforming uses are intended to be eliminated. He asked about taking the legal status recommendation a step further and applying it to all properties proposed for the I-Industrial designation.

Mr. Aaron stated that staff would prefer that the Commission approve staff's recommendation as written in the staff report. Staff understands Commissioner Densmore's request and believes it can be managed.

Commissioner Densmore clarified that the motion was only for the specific area on Jurupa.

Chair Leonard stated that during the previous discussions, he was not comfortable with the minimum lot standards. He inquired if the motion could include a definition of project areas instead of lot standards.

Commissioner Densmore agreed to include Chair Leonard's suggestion.

Chair Leonard stated that he would support the motion as stated because the Jurupa area is the heaviest industrial area in the City. He said he would not support an I-Industrial zoning designation in the areas southerly of the 91 Freeway or along Third Street to the 215 Freeway, as those areas are much more sensitive in appearance than the Jurupa area. He asked staff if an overlay zone could be applied to the Jurupa area so that it can clearly be separated in terms of standards and zones from the rest of the industrial areas in the City.

Mr. Aaron explained that to have a special area in the City signaled out for zoning that no other area in the City has would be difficult to administer over the long term. Staff can recommend the language to include in the General Plan, but that for zoning purposes, it would require an ordinance.

Commissioner Comer wanted to know what the result of this motion would mean to the entire City and whether the Commission was dealing with individual areas rather than the whole Zoning Code.

Mr. Aaron stated that staff's preference would be that the Commission deal with the whole City, but understands that the current motion is meant for one specific area. Staff can handle one area but it would be unmanageable to individually zone different pockets throughout the City.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6 ayes to 1 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Singletary
NOES:	Sebelia
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Item 11 – Permitted Uses Table 19.150.020(A)

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO APPROVE** Item 1, amending the Permitted Uses Table as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Leonard, Maloney, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None

DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Commissioner Densmore reminded the Commission that his earlier motion was for the Jurupa area. He asked if the Commission wanted to have any discussion on any of the other areas in the M-Zones that were now in the I-Industrial Zone.

Chair Leonard stated that individual requests have been submitted for the Commission's review. He asked if the Commission wanted to review them at this time or wait.

Commissioner Sebelia said that he thought all requests were going to be reviewed together. He felt that it was a mistake to apply special overlay zones or exempt areas, as doing so would not meet the intent of the process.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Sebelia, **TO APPROVE** the I-Industrial Zone for properties identified in the General Plan, with modification to staff's recommendation to allow current legally established uses to maintain legal status under the new zone.

Commissioner Sebelia wanted to make sure that there would be no indication of a nonconforming use on a property.

Commissioner Comer agreed.

Mr. Aaron inquired if the motion referred to the uses and standards.

Commissioner Comer said it would apply to the existing uses only.

Mr. Aaron stated that should the motion pass, staff will write the necessary language for this.

Commissioner Sebelia added that should the business quit for 180 days, the business would be zoned out of existence.

Commissioner Comer agreed.

Chair Leonard asked if staff was in a position to be able to administer this?

Mr. Aaron replied that it would be possible, but it would not be easy.

Commissioner Densmore stated he did not agree with the motion.

Commissioner Sebelia stated that this was a compromise position that provides property owners the ability to obtain a certificate of occupancy or bank loan. The business will be conforming until it is shut down.

Commissioner Comer agreed. The use on the property that voluntarily decides to pick up and move would lose the conforming status. The new tenant would have to live up to the current I or MP Zone standards.

Chair Leonard pointed out that this was a deferred implementation of the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Comer agreed.

Chair Leonard restated the motion. He stated that the uses presently within the M-1 and M-2 Zones that are legally established will continue to have conforming status under the I or BMP Zones.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 6 ayes to 1 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	Leonard
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Article V

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** in context Article V of the Zoning Code.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Article VI

Chair Leonard stated that the Airport Protection Overlay would be applied after Code adoption based on further study.

Ms. Jenkins replied affirmatively. She added that the Freeway Overlay was discussed and is listed in the Implementation Plan.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** Article VI as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Commissioner Comer recalled that staff will be revisiting the adult oriented businesses.

Article VII

Chair Leonard stated that Article VII is the section where the criteria for adult oriented businesses and individual specific uses are addressed.

Commissioner Densmore commented that these recommendations were made under the presumption that there would be nonconforming uses in the I Zone. He asked staff if items 20-22 would still apply to businesses that were currently operating legally or only to any new business in the future.

Ms. Jenkins explained that items 20-and 22 would be for new businesses. Businesses that are legally established, based on the Commission's recent motion, would be legally conforming.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** Article VII as outlined in the staff report.

Ms. Jenkins called the Commission's attention to item 19, adult oriented businesses. Consideration should be given to the fact that there are now more I Zone properties; and therefore, more opportunities for the adult oriented businesses in the City of Riverside. Staff has studied the sites and there are approximately 18 new sites for adult oriented businesses in the Jurupa area. The Commission may want to consider additional standards for this area in order to limit the number of adult oriented businesses. Staff suggested adding an additional setback requirement from the Santa Ana River, based on the Santa Ana River Task Force report incorporated in the General Plan.

Commissioner Singletary asked legal counsel if the number could be limited within an area. Given that there are approximately 18 additional opportunities for these businesses, can these businesses be limited to 1 within a certain radius?

Ms. Smith stated that the Commission was going in the right direction. The Commission can set the development standards, separation and distance requirements, realizing that these businesses have to be provided for. The standards can reduce the number in a given location but the criteria must be legitimate rational standards.

Commissioner Singletary stated it would be more appropriate to continue item 19 until updated criteria for these businesses can be provided.

Ms. Jenkins agreed. This would provide staff with additional time to develop additional language

Commissioner Densmore agreed to modify his motion pulling item 19 for continuance to the next meeting.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None

ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Article VIII – Items 20-25

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** Article VIII as outlined in the staff report.

Chair Leonard asked if the motion included the recommended changes 26-31

Commissioner Comer said yes.

Commissioner Sebelia inquired if there was a provision under affordable housing density bonuses to prohibit rentals.

Mr. Aaron explained that it would be unconstitutional for the Zoning Code to prohibit rentals in a certain area.

Ms. Smith explained that there are two issues. The City could not restrict the units to owner/occupied under the density bonus provided to developers, who provide low income housing of their own choice. However, under inclusionary housing it could be dealt in connection with an agreement between the developer and the Housing Division within the City. The development itself would come before the Commission, but it would not be within their purview to require a rental restriction in the agreement. The decision would solely be within the discretion of the Redevelopment Agency.

Chair Leonard asked if staff has considered including provisions for design guidelines in the Density Bonus Regulations to ensure the architectural standards are comparable to market rate development.

Ms. Jenkins stated that staff is recommending this change in item 26 of the staff report. Staff is recommending language to make sure that happens.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Article IX – Items 33-37

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** Article IX as outlined in the staff report.

Commissioner Densmore wanted to remind the Commission for the record about their discussion on item 31. The discussion wasn't so much about the verbiage or intent, it was the fact that it was added after the public testimony portion of the hearings.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Article X – Definitions (items 38-47)

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** Article X as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Items 49-50

Chair Leonard pointed out that these items came up after the staff report was published.

Ms. Jenkins informed the Commission that 49 was the transfer of density section from Article IX. This was one where text was added to ensure that the RC and RA-5 Zones were excepted. Staff wanted to make sure this was clear. Item 50 was just highlighting to the Commission the areas from the General Plan staff report where the Commission changed the General Plan designation from what staff recommended. The Commission may want to consider changing the zoning on those to maintain consistency. Ms. Jenkins reminded the Commission that Riverside is a Charter City and zoning and General Plan does not have to be consistent.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** Item 49 as outlined in the staff report.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Ms. Jenkins reviewed the sites referred in item 50 and read to the Commission the recommended zones for these sites should they wish to maintain the zoning consistent with the General Plan designations.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** Item 50 as recommended by staff.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Chair Leonard asked the Commission for formal action on the Zoning Code, for approval based on all of the changes.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO APPROVE** the Zoning Code and forward the Commission's recommendations to the City Council.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

The Commission took a 5-minute break.

Individual Site Requests

Site A – 3215, 3230 and 3245 Madison Street

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

Chair Leonard explained that these sites were put off until the Commission had voted on the Zoning Code. The Commission will review the individual sites and vote on a Zoning designation.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Sebelia, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to CR-NC.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area B – 3772 Arlington Avenue/3762 Hardin Street

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Comer, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to O Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area C – 3770 – 3780 Washington Street

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to O Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area D – Hunter Business Park Sites

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

Commissioner Densmore asked if Commissioner Comer's earlier motion replacing the Manufacturing Park with I or BMP applied to this area.

Ms. Jenkins replied affirmatively and added that the area was also subject to the Hunter Business Park Specific Plan.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to I Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area E – 11503 Pierce St.

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary of the site. She reminded the Commission that the site has a General Plan land use designation of I-Industrial and for consistency they should consider zoning the property to I Zone. She stated that staff would encourage the BMP Zone because of the single family and multi-family residential uses surrounding this site.

Commissioner Densmore stated he would support the I Zone as requested by the property owner.

Commissioner Norton stated that she was uncomfortable with the I Zone because of the residential property surrounding this site.

Commissioner Sebelia recalled this site specifically because the applicant had written two letters. In one of the letters there was an indication that the property owner had something in mind for the future development of the site. Commissioner Sebelia felt that the BMP Zone was appropriate.

Commissioner Densmore noted that the site had a thriving industrial complex which he was looking to protect.

Mr. Aaron stated that if the Commission wanted to continue this item, staff could provide the letters and information on this site at the next meeting.

Chair Leonard stated that his recollection was that the BMP Zone allowed the use as it currently exists. There was some indication from the operator or property owner regarding something in the future. He supported the BMP Zone at this site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Leonard, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation for the BMP Zone.

Chair Leonard noted that this was not Jurupa Avenue. He agreed with Commissioner Norton in that this use is surrounded by both the University and residential uses and that the range of uses allowed by the I Zone would not be compatible. He felt this required a bit more conservatism in terms of maintaining the BMP Zone.

MOTION CARRIED by a vote of 4 ayes to 2 no and 0 disqualified and 0 abstentions.

AYES: Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: Comer, Densmore
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Staff noted that areas F and G had already been taken care of earlier.

Area H – 4151 and 4221 Buchanan Street

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Maloney, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Comer, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to BMP Zone, except the City owned property should be placed in the PF Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area I – Sycamore Canyon Business Park

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Norton, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Densmore, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to the BMP Zone, except the City owned property should be placed in the PF Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Chair Leonard announced that the Commission already voted on area J and K.

Area L – 1145 Everton Pl.

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Maloney, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to the Public Facilities Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Area M – Rohr Property (BF Goodrich)

Ms. Jenkins gave a brief summary on the site. She noted that the applicant has written a number of letters requesting the I Zone, an inconsistency between the General Plan designation and Zoning. Staff feels comfortable with this particular request. The General Plan designation is what staff would envision for this property over the next 20 years, however, to accommodate the existing use on the property the I Zone would be appropriate.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Singletary, **TO APPROVE** staff's recommendation to the I Zone.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES:	Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES:	None
DISQUALIFIED:	None
ABSTAINED:	None
ABSENT:	Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Chair Leonard stated that at the last meeting Charles Schultz submitted a request regarding a property in Woodcrest. Mr. Schultz requested a consideration of the Mixed-Use Neighborhood.

Ms. Jenkins stated she did not have a powerpoint exhibit for this request but at the last meeting staff included exhibits attached to Mr. Schultz' letter.

Commissioner Comer asked what staff's recommendation was for this area.

Ms. Jenkins stated that staff's recommendation was General Plan designation of Commercial and Zoning designation of Commercial Retail.

Mr. Aaron added that this is one of those cases where staff has not had adequate opportunity to review the request. A policy adopted at the beginning of these hearings was that staff would not entertain these kinds of individual requests. The only ones we really have looked at are the ones with more compelling reason to be changed now. Staff recommended that this be considered as an individual request in the future.

Ms. Jenkins stated that now that the Commission has looked at the individual sites, one last thing that needs to be done is to approve the Zoning Map which would apply the rest of the zones throughout the City per the Zoning Map in the Zoning Code.

Item 5 – Zoning Map

Chair Leonard asked for a motion on the Zoning Map. He stated that this would reflect all of the changes undertaken during the past three hearings.

MOTION MADE by Commissioner Densmore, **SECONDED** by Commissioner Norton, **TO APPROVE** the Zoning Code with all the revisions.

MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

AYES: Comer, Densmore, Maloney, Leonard, Norton, Sebelia, Singletary
NOES: None
DISQUALIFIED: None
ABSTAINED: None
ABSENT: Agnew, Brown, Kurani

Chair Leonard announced that the next meeting date for the General Plan hearing would be August 18, 2005, at 3:00 pm. The two items remaining is a discussion of the adult entertainment standards and action on the Implementation Plan.

Chair Leonard opened the hearing for public comments.

Kimberly Sparkman, Sparkman's Garage, asked the chair if she could ask questions of staff. Based on tonight's motions, if she sells her business, the new owner can continue with a legally conforming business. She did not understand why the 180 day limit would apply if her business were a conforming business. This time limit standard is usually applied to nonconforming status properties. She thanked the Commission for their time and for listening to the citizens.

Ms. Jenkins explained that this was how the motion was worded.

Commissioner Densmore clarified for Ms. Sparkman that there were two motions made. The intent of the first motion, which applied to the Jurupa area did not include a time limit. He noted that she was interpreting the second motion which does not apply to that area.

Rosalina Grisco, Grisco Kennel, thanked the Commission.

Arlee Montalvo, 4474 Picachu Drive, spoke on behalf of the Riverside/Corona Resource Conservation District, the County/City Arroyo Watershed Committee and also meeting with them was the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. She asked for assistance in copying and distributing to the Commission the big maps that they were working on.

Ms. Jenkins asked Ms. Montalvo to contact her after the meeting so that they could discuss any possible assistance.

Mary Humbolt, 7407 Dufferin Avenue, objected to the density transfer and density bonuses. She felt that this kind of intense density does not belong in the City.

MaryAnn Hillman, 7701 Woodshold Court, asked whom she and her neighbors could contact regarding this proposal. They have sent letters requesting additional information but have not heard back from anyone.

Ms. Jenkins provided a business card and ask Ms. Hillman to call her.

B. ADJOURNMENT

2. Adjournment to the August 18, 2005 meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the Art Pick Council Chambers.